

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, 4 New York Avenue, Garden City, N. Y. President: G. J. Harbo, Secretary: J. J. Harbo, Treasurer: J. J. Harbo, Editor: J. J. Harbo, Managing Editor: J. J. Harbo, Business Manager: J. J. Harbo, Circulation Manager: J. J. Harbo, Advertising Manager: J. J. Harbo, Printing Manager: J. J. Harbo, Distribution Manager: J. J. Harbo, Post Office: J. J. Harbo, Mail Matter: J. J. Harbo.

Subscription Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York: Daily, 10¢ a week; 50¢ a month; \$1.50 a quarter; \$4.50 a half year; \$9.00 a year. In Advance. Single Copies: 5¢.

Foreign Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York: Daily, 10¢ a week; 50¢ a month; \$1.50 a quarter; \$4.50 a half year; \$9.00 a year. In Advance. Single Copies: 5¢.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

A Legal Housecleaning.

In disbaring thirteen lawyers and imposing less severe penalties on several others, the Appellate Division has taken action almost unprecedented in the extent of the punishment. There is bound to be thorough approval, both from the public and the right-thinking members of this honorable profession.

The disrepute into which lawyers have fallen, as a class, is a serious thing. "Officers of the court," sworn public servants, they have come to be condemned, the good with the bad, as money grabbers, promoters of unnecessary litigation, tricksters who for their own profit twist and turn technicalities so that "law" takes precedence of justice. Of course not all of them deserve this indiscriminate condemnation. Yet the conditions in their profession were felt to be so bad that a committee of the State Bar Association recently presented a long report calling for "ways and means for holding lawyers to much stricter accountability for their shortcomings than has been done in the past."

The lawyers themselves can abate this evil state better than any other agency by strict supervision of lists of applicants for admission to the bar and by co-operation with the authorities in housecleanings such as the Appellate Division has just made when they prove necessary. Meantime the effect of this rather wholesale weeding out of undesirable ought to be wholesome in discouraging sharp practice on the part of those members of the profession whose greed is stronger than their sense of decency.

New York's Living Costs.

Residents of this fair city who groan under the strain of making the weekly pay check meet the demands of the weekly budget will be pleased to learn that there is no high cost of living in the metropolis. They'd better give up that idea of moving out into the country to live more cheaply, because it can't be done. The Central Mercantile Association is authority for the statement. It finds that there are in three Eastern cities—Buffalo, Richmond and Baltimore—are food prices lower than here. Clothing is cheaper than in most other places, or, at least, no dearer. Rent is higher here, but the total of this in the family budget is held to assume only slight proportions, in view of other living costs which may be lowered in the metropolis.

The expense of living in New York, the statisticians maintain, is due to the fact that so many enticing opportunities for spending money exist, and every fellow and his wife want to live just as well as their neighbors who may happen to have a better lined pocket. There is nothing startlingly new in the pronouncement. It is within the personal knowledge of every struggler here. Nevertheless, there seems to be no great exodus from the great city on that account, and those individuals who go are replaced by others coming into town, willing to pay for the pleasures and benefits the city can give them.

Figured out on a basis of the necessities of life, living costs here are just about what they would be anywhere else where the city dweller happened to be able to make his living. He lives in New York because he is willing to pay the premium for "extras," because of what the extras give him in a fuller existence. New York, as a matter of fact, costs more, but it's worth the price.

A Motherhood Strike.

A motherhood strike for the advancement of suffrage is not a new idea. Miss Kate Barnard, the dynamic little person of Oklahoma, suggested its efficacy here three years ago and then became frightened at the headlines which her words induced. In the interval there have sprung up few, if any, other public advocates of a measure so drastic, though without a doubt the minds of a great many of both sexes have been turning over the idea, such a tremendous idea!—woman's refusal to bear children for the state which denies her a voice in its management. And already, Mrs. Sara Bard Field says, some individual women here and there are putting it into effect.

But a strike is of no value unless it entails collective effort, and it is precisely this which no motherhood strike seems ever likely to attain. Such a collective effort would imply an organization of sex beyond anything the world has known or seems likely to know and a conception of the state as a self-perpetuating entity similar to that which the German "intellectuals" profess. The ladies of America, it is needless to say, move in a mental orbit distant a great many paragraphs from either.

Meanwhile, what of the unfortunate husbands of these individual strikers? It is entirely reasonable to suppose that an overwhelming majority, if not all of them,

are already ardent pro-suffragists. Further punishment can exact from them nothing more, and yet it is upon them, provided they share the normal male desire for parenthood, that practically the entire burden of the state's sins must rest. This seems a trifle unfair, to say the least.

Would not a better method of warfare, more beneficial to all concerned, be the raising of so many sons imbued with suffrage sentiment that votes for women must come eventually with the weight of their influence? Why leave the future to the children of ants?

Liberty's Return.

The people of the United States are well used to incongruities in their national life and are capable of a good laugh in the midst of their sentimentalities, but there is a decent limit to the strain which should be put upon their sense of humor. That limit has been passed in the entire to be staged at each stop as the Liberty Bell makes its sacred way back to Philadelphia.

To Philadelphia, of all places! A city once more to be plunged into the night of boss ridden government, of unofficial absolutism! But Americans have become accustomed to the thought of Philadelphia as the resting place of their beloved symbol of political liberty. They might even muster a smile at the thought, disgusting as it is, if now there were not to be added the supreme indignity. In brief, Senator Penrose is a member of the delegation which the city of Philadelphia is sending out to escort the Liberty Bell home, and will be one of the orators whose addresses will mark each pause in its return. "Oh, Liberty! Liberty! How many crimes are committed in thy name!"

But has Mr. Penrose no sense of shame whatever? Our Mr. Murphy, in forbearing to greet the President, displays a much greater delicacy. Indeed, from contemplation of the effrontery of the Senator from Pennsylvania we may yet come to an appreciation of our fellow townsman. Though once he may have eaten peas with a knife, he has always had the good taste to remain in the background.

Political Effects of Air Raids.

In the curious explanation published lately in several German papers, and presumably inspired by the German government, an attempt is made not only to justify the repeated air raids on London and other English towns, but to demonstrate the value of such exploits in several ways. The emphasis laid on the military importance of the metropolis indicates that the apology is intended in part as an answer to critics who are disposed to question the propriety or utility of these murderous exploits; but the apologist goes further, and, setting military considerations aside, proceeds to enlarge on certain economical and political effects which he conceives to be easily provable by the testimony of the victims themselves.

In doing so he apparently counts on hopes and expectations which are still widespread in Germany, but may prove in the event to be entirely delusive. It may, indeed, be doubted whether the most sanguine Germans have quite so much confidence in these expectations as they had when the war began. They were taught to believe that the British Empire was crumbling, that India and South Africa were ripe for revolt, and that in the United Kingdom itself disruption of the gravest sort was imminent. There was evidence enough to support this belief, nor can it be doubted that even the soberest observers were astounded at the complete failure of their expectations.

So incomprehensible, however, are English ways to the generality of Germans, that very possibly many may still find comfort in the manifest dissensions among politicians. These are particularly dwelt upon in the explanation of the air raids. "The drastic measures proposed, without regard to the economic effects, show most clearly," the author observes, "what importance the English themselves attach to the Zeppelin attacks. The British government finds itself in a painful position. We can note with satisfaction that here, too, the effects of our military operations on English economic life have led to political differences of opinion of the most serious nature, calculated still further to undermine the unity of the British government."

It would be dangerous to calculate too confidently on such doubtful symptoms. England has always been misleading in this way. When Louis XIV had a mind to attempt invasion he was too much influenced by such considerations. Yet party differences were much more pronounced then than they are to-day, the disaffection of Ireland was more nearly unanimous and far deeper than it was a year and a half ago, Scotland's loyalty was extremely questionable, and there was good reason even to doubt the sentiments of many of the officers of the army and navy. As an eighteenth century author, in a valuable but almost wholly forgotten history of the navy, remarks: "Dissatisfactions were visible in all parts of the three kingdoms, and to such as live under governments where freedom of speech is prohibited the clamors of a few factious spirits are considered expressive of the people at large."

Now, as the Germans, in the light of their own experience at home, are undoubtedly apt to exaggerate the significance of these signs and portents, so, on the other hand, it is very possible that they do not rightly estimate the psychological consequences of raids. On this point, too, a passage from the same historian may be pertinent: "In England the people grew weary of a continental war which had been carried on at a vast expense."

Although the liberty of England depended eventually on the reduction of the power of the French monarch, yet as the English saw not his dragons at their doors they believed themselves exempted from the influence of his power. Such were the contents which had seized these three kingdoms, nor was there more unanimity

and cordiality among those who composed the administration." Is it not at least conceivable that the Zeppelins may have consequences exactly contrary to those counted upon in the semi-official apology?

A Great Dining Club's History.

The public dinner has had many hard knocks in recent years. Once it was one of the most respected institutions of this city, and what was the fashion here became the fashion in other cities. When Chauncey M. Depew was at the height of his reputation as a post-prandial orator, when Joseph H. Choate, Mark Twain and General Horace Porter scintillated month in and month out at festive gatherings, when the speeches at the annual dinner of the New England Society filled a couple of pages in The Tribune, this form of entertainment enjoyed a popularity which can be looked back to now with something like astonishment. It also served in a notable degree as a medium for influencing public opinion—a function which it has nearly surrendered with the passing of the years.

The old public dinner was too formal, too serious, too ponderous for the taste of the present generation. So the new style came in, in which vaudeville has taken the place of oratory and the "tired business man" refreshes his senses instead of taxing his intellectual receptiveness. The guests of honor used to pay their score by entertaining their hosts. Now the hosts do most of the entertaining themselves or else hire outsiders and pay the bill.

Each style has its merits and demerits. We are not partisans of either. The contrast between them and the great change which has come over public dinner customs could not, perhaps, be brought home more clearly to the student of such matters than it is in Mr. Arthur W. Dunn's most interesting "Gridiron Nights," just published by the Frederick A. Stokes Company. Mr. Dunn tells the story of the most famous dining club in America, that maintained for the last thirty years by the newspaper correspondents stationed in Washington. The Gridiron Club has entertained Presidents, Ambassadors, Senators, Representatives, Cabinet officers, Governors and men of distinction in all walks of life. An invitation to its board has always been prized by the discerning, and it is only the bare truth to say that no entertainment it has ever given has disappointed those who were lucky enough to figure on the invitation list.

In this volume of nearly 400 pages the development of the American public dinner can be clearly and accurately traced—from the earlier simpler model, according to which the speeches of the guests were the dominant feature, to the later, more sophisticated practice, under which elaborate burlesques of personages and events have taken the first place on the programme.

The Gridiron dinner has never been a public dinner in the proper sense. The first rule of the club in its earlier days was: "Ladies are always present; reporters are never present." In those days no one spoke except under the strict seal of privacy and confidence. In recent years, when criticism of men and things had sharpened, it became impossible to keep what happened under the sign of the gridiron out of the newspapers. Summaries of the burlesques were given out, and even what public men said about one another slipped into print.

The most conspicuous instance of this change of policy was the publication in "The Washington Post" of the famous verbal encounter between President Roosevelt and Senator Joseph B. Foraker at the time when the shooting up of Brownsville, Tex., was being investigated in the Senate. All that happened was not told. But so much was told that Mr. Dunn retells the story in his book—and it is well worth retelling as a part of the personal politics of the second Roosevelt administration.

Dozens of interesting incidents might be cited from these records illuminating the personal side of politics at Washington. We have not space for them here. They only emphasize the intense interest of gatherings of this sort, where men of note lay aside formality, see themselves laughed at and join in the laughs created at the expense of others. On such occasions everybody gets pretty well down to human nature. Ridicule is a leveller, and little harm is done by its caprices if the spirit behind it is kept clean and kindly.

The Gridiron Club has kept its record clean in that respect. Its dinners are still what entertainments of the sort ought to be—gay, wholesome and lacking in malice. It could not maintain itself if they were not. Political and social Washington respects the club because it maintains its own respect. It is an institution known far and wide, and its influence, both on the press and on public life, is salutary. The record of its activities which Mr. Dunn has compiled is one which will interest thousands outside the club's long list of guests. It must appeal to all who want to see maintained at a praiseworthy level the now somewhat neglected art of public dinner giving.

Belgrade.

(From The Westminster Gazette.)

Belgrade, the capital of the kingdom of Serbia, which has now fallen into the hands of the Germans, has gradually, for many years past, been losing its old, Turkish aspect, becoming more modern, more European. The history of the city for nearly a thousand years has been one of continual contests. The walls have disappeared since 1822; the last and finest of the five gates was demolished in 1868, and the citadel is not up to the requirements of modern warfare. The manufactures of Belgrade consist of arms, cutlery, saddlery, silk goods, carpets, etc. The chief buildings in the city are the royal and episcopal palaces, the government houses, the Cathedral, barracks, bazars, national theatre, and various educational institutions. The population is about 70,000.

LET THE LIBRARIES ALONE

Shortsighted Economy to Reduce Their Appropriations.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Very little has been said or known about the injury to the libraries by the recent economy scheme of the Mayor. If there is one city department which needs no reduction in its appropriation it is the Library Department. The system is one which serves the people directly, efficiently, and is of great educational value. It is the poorest paid department in the city.

The investigators recently sent out by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment were paid far higher salaries than the librarians, although many of them knew nothing of library work. They have recommended that many of the libraries be closed during the morning because the public patronizes the library very little during those hours. They could not understand that a large part of a librarian's work—such as sorting out the books, replacing them on the shelves, making up accounts, getting out bulletins and many other things—must be done when the public is absent. The only saving thereby effected would be that a number of girls would lose their positions.

The girls are paid miserable salaries as they must be, but they are at least a good high school education, and many are college graduates. They commence at the minimum salary of \$45 a month—about \$10 a week—an office boy's wage. The next higher grade pays \$55, and to get it a girl must pass a stiff examination in general literature, foreign languages, general information and details of library work itself. Further, the average girl cannot even take the examination until she serves two years.

Head librarians, who are equal in education and general knowledge to many school principals and have large staffs of girls under them, receive about \$1,200 a year, and serve many years to get that princely salary. Nearly all other city employees, such as the police, firemen, teachers, etc., have pensions to look forward to. Librarians, with salaries 50 per cent smaller, have no pensions.

Libraries are kept open late in the evening and all holidays. These are the employees Mayor Mitchell is attacking. Let him cut out the fat political jobs, but leave the library system alone.

FRANK BALDWIN.

New York, Nov. 3, 1915.

Train the School Children.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: "The Lesson of Ball Run" of The Tribune of October 10 so forcibly portrays our "national unpreparedness" that one can but cry aloud, "How long before the real men of the United States will arise and with giant strides marshal our forces into line for training?"

While we are experimenting with the "Garry system" in our schools for economy of space are we not saving with a teaspoon and wasting with a shovel the time that should be expended in training all the pupils in military tactics, that in any event can only be of lasting benefit, mentally and physically, to both boys and girls?

Cannot the fathers and mothers of this country be trusted to give their children the proper religious training? Why ignore our churches and Sunday schools? If it took the Kaiser forty years to educate the Germans into their present state of barbarism, is it not time for the United States to get busy if we are to count for anything in the future?

If America is to be deluged with the cheap manufactures of Europe at the close of the war, is it not time to instruct our people what are American dyes and American manufactures? And can we not trust to Americans discriminating against any colors coming from Germany at any time while the present generation is in possession of their memory? Is any one really neutral?

Not so! Not so! With real American blood in his veins. E. F. VAN ALLEN.

Schedack Landing, N. Y., Oct. 31, 1915.

Why Shed More Blood?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: No doubt many agree that while Europe is bathed in blood one hears nothing but the planning of festivities at the White House. It would be poor taste to flaunt our happiness to our neighbor in whose house death had entered, showing a lack of sympathy. However, we need not invite death, too, in order that we, too, must mourn. If John Jones commits murder, certainly it would be unjust to execute Peter Brown for his crime. Yet that seems to be the logic of war.

The awful catastrophe of the Lusitania is deplorable, but why should more blood be shed to avenge these dead? If nations could be taught to seek redress by sane legal reasoning and punishing the real guilty culprits only, then, indeed, we might consider ourselves civilized. Why the beautiful Court of Peace at The Hague and all this clamoring for war and bloodshed?

War is to many men the most barbaric relic of barbarism—a battle of brains and brains. Doesn't the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" apply at all times? Is it applied to the murderer in his cell; has the law another set of commandments? For while preachers preach this the condemned is waiting to be legally put to death.

May woman's suffrage purify politics and law with the true spirit of Christ reigning and the greatest book of all on philosophy, the Bible, as a guide. A WOMAN.

New York, Nov. 2, 1915.

Intensely American.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the issue of September 9 a contributor, John Lehane, asked, "Where in the City of New York can I join an Intensely American society whose basic principle is the prevention of German-Americans or Austrian-Americans from ever being elected to office?" After a painstaking search I have at last found a society such as he wishes to join.

This society is opposed to citizens of foreign birth (German-Americans and Austrian-Americans are undoubtedly included) being elected to office. It is known as the Society of Native Born of U. S. A., and its meetings are held at 390 Third Avenue, city.

The stipulation for membership is that the applicant must be a native born. If Mr. Lehane is a native born I am positive that he will be gladly accepted as a member of this society.

I am nowise connected with this society, but I am doing a good turn for the society, because the officials are imparting information to me that will be of beneficial use.

BROOKLYN, NOV. 1, 1915. FRED HAHN.

Spreading the Cost.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wonder how people will enjoy the knowledge that a great many are contributing to the profits of those supplying the Allies with munitions of war. We have just been notified of an advance of 40 cents a hundred pounds, or about one-half cent a pound, on prices for wire. This is no small item, equal to about 10 per cent advance.

HENRY W. STRUSS.

New York, Nov. 8, 1915.

FOR AMERICAN NON-INTERVENTION AND PREPAREDNESS

An Argument Against Mixing in a European Quarrel Based on Territorial Rivalries and Aspirations—Prepare Ourselves or Commit National Suicide.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I should like very much to answer in detail some of the letters that have recently appeared in your columns from the pens of Mr. Davidson, R. P. N., Idiotic Yankee, A. S. Pier, W. C. Symons, M. I. Swift, Conrad Hobbs, American Citizen, F. B. and others.

In reply to my critic, F. B. I will say that I still continue to disagree with him as to the cause of our state of unpreparedness. The majority of the people know that we must be prepared; the majority of the people are not in a position to "love ease," as F. B. says.

Let us be more definite. Time and again Congress has refused to pass bills calling for adequate armament. The people are sick and tired of hearing about proposed increases which never seem to materialize. Either we must prepare ourselves or commit national suicide. To Representative Gardner, of Massachusetts, we owe much; had it not been for him our army would consist of about a dozen men armed with peace pipes. Optimistic feminists like Bryan should be ashamed to call themselves Americans, preaching about peace and unpreparedness.

This important question is not a party affair or a social chatter-box; it is a national question in the fullest sense. A Congressman who votes against preparedness should be blackballed by the people. He is hypocritical in the fullest sense of the word. Like F. B. it is difficult to think how men in such responsible positions can express the foolish, groundless arguments they do in attacking ample preparedness. Surely, they say, if 9 per cent of the population of Serbia is unable to defend Serbia, then one-twentieth of 1 per cent will be more than enough to protect us, especially when they are thousands of miles apart in a great many instances.

If we do not proceed to increase the effectiveness of our army and navy now we never shall. Europe is spending its energy—creating navies, armies, munitions, and all while we are still tagging along. There is no American nation charges Congress to raise both army and navy from the ranks and make the navy more than a "celluloid-in-the-bath-tub" and the army more than "so many chocolate soldiers."

Right here I must put The Tribune on the back and say "Well done." The "Sham" was a masterpiece—as good an editorial as I have ever read in any newspaper. An American citizen ought to read the "Sham," not just for the reading, but because there's something in it it's got some "punch" and it's the truth.

A large majority of the letters recently published in The Tribune concerning our future European course speak for intervention, on the ground that unless we help the Allies in their fight for civilization we are traitors to the world—this especially from Morrison I. Swift. This assertion makes an interesting subject for discussion. Let us test it and observe. To begin with, let us see what England has been doing. Slowly but surely the world has come to recognize the might and hugeness of the British Empire. It is said of the British Empire that it has never set upon it. The British possess one-fourth of the land area of the globe; it is the hugest empire in existence.

of real intelligence and plain self-respect sufficient to bar them from lying could seriously say they feared invasion of this country. The utter flattening of all military spirit of European aggression will be so thoroughly complete when the present terrific war is done that there will be nothing even possible, much less probable, as a new military move against any real national power. And as for Japan? The Japanese governmental councils would no more willingly declare war against the United States than they would deliberately import into Japan a fatal pestilence or other means of wholesale self-destruction. Japan is poor; Japan is wise.

ALFRED LAURENS BRENNAN.

New York, Nov. 1, 1915.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There are three nervous habits which are popular in this country, smoking, rocking and gum chewing. One does not object to smoking so much on aesthetic principles. The odor of a good cigar is not disagreeable (when the wind is blowing the other way). The habit might be encouraged if the occasional smoker did not tend to become an habitual smoker. The habitual smoker sacrifices not only a part of his income to the habit, he sacrifices also his sense of smell and taste and his digestion. Besides, he is a slave, and no slave is enviable.

But as far as looks go the smoker is ahead of the gum chewer. Through the gum chewing habit New York City is more and more assuming the general appearance of an idiot asylum. Some can smoke in a graceful, nonchalant manner. To carry a stick about in one's mouth may look a trifle weak minded, but the gum chewer invariably looks perfectly imbecile. Nothing imparts so quickly to one's countenance the appearance of senility and softening of the brain as gum chewing.

New York City might be divided socially into two classes—those who chew gum and those who don't. A woman enters the car. She is well dressed and her features are pleasing. One wonders "Is she a lady?" Her jaws begin to wag, her cheek bulges. The question is promptly answered in the negative.

There are two commodities which are peculiarly American—rocking chairs and gum. Both are outlets for nervousness. Let us rock if we must, but if we are ladies and gentlemen our regard for refinement and repose of manner will save us from gum chewing. Suppose the vitality consumed in these jaw gyrations was devoted to some worthwhile end, what a conservation of energy it would be!

A REFORMER.

New York, Nov. 2, 1915.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Secretary Garrison's eclecticism is much too fully supplied with sophistication. His official willingness to go very considerably gratify militia officers smacks altogether too much of the common political dodger against which well-to-do sentiment in intelligent newspaper editors is now unmistakably rising into effective protest.

Secretary Garrison holds no legal authority whatsoever to arrange for incorporation of the militia with anything at all. In point of fact the President himself has no constitutional authority over the militia except in war time or when, military law being declared, the militia is needed for service in actual support of Federal authority.

And yet we find Mr. Secretary Garrison, together with similar practical politicians, busily fixing up and setting forth just what—according to them and their illegal decisions—may or may not be done all along the militia line whereby militia officers are to be made glad of their own importance (deserved or not), while sums total of possibly a million millions of the rank and file are to be maneuvered into highly undesirable and corporate with the United States regular army establishment, so that they can, on any old occasion, be forced to serve abroad.

This whole hurrah about preparedness and defence is sheer politics. The least of observers can readily perceive that. Nobody

Britain has the Suez Canal. Can anybody truthfully say that she has not hopes of some day seeing the Panama Canal a British possession? For what is England fighting? For commercial supremacy? For more territory? She surely is not fighting for civilization. How can she with an ally like Russia, which, as A. Perlman so truly says, murders its worthy Jews, wrecks their homes and drives those whom it does not kill into exile—Russia, which has always been the least civilized of all Europe's nations? With an ally like France, which fights for revenge, a revenge she has been nursing for forty-five years; France fights mainly to regain Alsace-Lorraine, which Louis XIV originally took from Prussia. With Italy for an ally—Italy, which was dishonorably bought for the possible conquest of Trent and Trieste. Serbia, the poor little Balkan state, which sadly enough thought that England's power could keep the Teuton away.

Let us now consider the Teutons. Why militarism? Prince von Bismarck, the greatest European statesman, knew that Germany's geographical situation in Europe compelled her to be either a world power or a large vassal of another nation. Germany, in order that she might exist, has had to have a mighty army. It has been Germany's life, just as England's navy has been hers. With Teuton thoroughness Germany has made her army one of the seven wonders of the world. This militarism, because it has proven a stumbling block to the Allies, because it has carried on successful offensives, because it is now beating the Serbians, is all wrong. Allied militarism is just because it fights for civilization. We have this militarism been prominent, such an outstanding feature of all military affairs and ideas during the past century? It is disliked because of the need of compulsory service. It has been especially evident because it has drained more proportionately upon the population than in any other country. For every three men in Germany there are eight in Russia, yet in size the armies are about equal, which means that German militarism is about three times as noticeable as Russian; the same may be said of France, Italy and Austria.

What effect has militarism had upon Germany and the Germans? Germany, like France and Russia, has been over-taxed and compulsory service has been exceedingly strict, being two of the principal reasons why several hundred thousand Germans have emigrated to this country with their families. The military party, on account of the important part it plays in the life of the nation, has practically ruled by itself; this has taken away a good deal of the democracy which formerly dominated in the nation's affairs. As to what Edward Thomas said in yesterday's Tribune, it is only true in some respects. He has exaggerated in that he says, "Where an ideal of military preparedness is lived up to a large part of the most intelligent men are drawn from productive life and have their lives, during working hours, wrapped up only in living up to the regulations of a military handbook and in studying how the military power may most efficiently dominate the rest of the community."

This is true in only a very small way, because if we were thoroughly true how could Germany carry on such a wonderful commerce, be one of the best educated nations, lead the world in the arts, music and science, manufacture extensively, besides being a hardy race? No! These things could not be.

Europe has taught us a double lesson: let us profit by it. Firstly, that war is worse than hell, and, secondly, unless we are prepared we must mechanically invite national suicide. Preparation is everything; moreover, it takes time. We cannot prepare in a night, nor in a year. We must keep preparing, always remembering, nevertheless, that the worst may come at any time. We must not allow individual prejudices to govern our attitude as Americans. We must think only of what is best for America. The fight is none of ours. As Hudson Maxim said: "Our first duty is to maintain peace; our second duty is to prepare for war."

J. EDWARD LUMBARD, JR.

New York, Nov. 1, 1915.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial headed "Deserter Defeat" carries a statement of many truths, more especially about the hoggliness of the rural voters in his congenial disposition to make this city carry its own load, the countryman's load besides. My experience and observation of over a generation have taught me that he is not only just a corrupt as the city voter, whose corruption he loves to dilute upon, but he sells himself much cheaper than the city man.

But I think that your editorial is open to the construction of unfairness, doublet unintentional, toward Governor Whitman, in that you, in effect, load the entire defeat upon his administration, which is far from being the truth. You seem to be oblivious to the fact that there is and was bound to be very close connection between a Tammany victory and a successful attempt upon the part of the city administration to reduce expenses by reducing salaries; and still the is what every sane citizen might have expected, if indeed for no other reason than it tended to line up every holder of a position under the city government "again the government," irrespective of whether his salary had been reduced or not. Certes if the dangerous disease of "reducing salaries" was allowed, even seemingly, to receive public approval, there was no knowing how far the disease would run, nor where and when it would stop. The "beef eaters" know, even if taxpayers do not, "upon which side their bread is buttered"; hence they were bound to do line up "again the government."

It would therefore seem as if Governor Glynn and his party had also cottoned to the "rural voter" by appropriating money for cleaning out frog ponds. The thing which puzzles me is how that fact came to be overlooked by the editor in writing to-day's article; and more especially how the fact that Governor Whitman's administration had to find the money to pay the bills for cleaning out Democratic frog ponds escaped notice by the editor in writing the article which roasts a Republican Governor and Legislature, and, seemingly, at least, both Governor Glynn and a Democratic Legislature. The fact that "economy" will have a hard row to hoe, and that, as usual, every one is in favor of the abstract principle, but opposed to specific application, is the principle which was taught by yesterday's election in this state, aside from the impending burial next year of "Wilsonians," which Congressman Bennett's election indicates. What can one expect when the principal opponents of high taxation—the real estate interests—object, in the short ballot and budget amendments to the constitution? They object to the methods bound to produce what they howl for—reduced taxation by reason of reduced expenditure, by reason of centralized administration. No other way has ever been known by which these desired results could be obtained.

MAX H. BROMBACHER.

New York, Nov. 8, 1915.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your motto: First to last the truth, what is a lie? Your editorial of to-day "Germany is Beaten!" This documents your ignorance very plainly. It is an utterly silly and untrue article. You can fool some people, etc., you know!

JAC MC CARTHY